

**DETECTIVE
BURNS**

**GRILLED BY
DORSEY**

**FOR OVER AN
HOUR**

In Presence of Judge
Hill,

Solicitor Secures
Detailed

Story of Detective's
Work in

Frank Case

NO FURTHER
EVIDENCE

IN HIS
POSSESSION

Full Story of Solicitor's
Long

Cross-Examination Is Given Below—Lehon to Be Exam- ined Later

Detective William J. Burns, on the witness stand for a special examination before Judge Ben H. Hill, was grilled by Solicitor General Dorsey about his connection with the Frank, or Mary Phagan murder case, for more than an hour Saturday morning.

The solicitor demonstrated by his questions that he has closely followed the movements of the detective both in Atlanta and the various other cities which he has visited since he became identified with the case.

The solicitor brought out the fact that every bit of evidence which has been discovered by Burns or his agents is either now a part of the record or is in the hands of the attorneys for the defense.

The solicitor developed that Burns has no further evidence, either physical, documentary, or in the form of testimony of witnesses.

In answer to a question, Burns stated that so far as he knows, the defense has no witnesses, whose testimony has not been injected into the case.

He secured the admission that Burns has discovered proof of no crime committed by Conley.

CLAIMS HE WAS HAMPERED.

By cross-examination Attorney Reuben R. Arnold, of the defense, brought out the statement from the detective that he has been blocked and hampered in his work here in a surprising manner. On redirect examination Mr. Burns cited the Monteen Stover and the Conley incidents as "the most outrageous examples of the manner in which his work had been hampered."

When Mr. Arnold was asking the wit-

(Continued on Page 3, Col. 1.)

PDF PAGE 3, COLUMN 1

SOLICITOR DORSEY KEEPS BURNS ON GRILL FOR AN HOUR

(Continued From Page 1.)

ness about the manner in which his work had been hampered, Judge Hill interrupted with this statement: "I am not going to allow this witness to answer any question, which reflects upon the verdict of the jury or the decision of the supreme court of Georgia."

Dan S. Lehon, a Burns agent, was subpoenaed to appear before Judge Hill but his examination was deferred until Monday.

A detailed report of the examination of Detective Burns follows:

Mr. Burns arrived in court about five minutes late. He was accompanied by Attorney Reuben R. Arnold of the Frank defense.

Mr. Arnold addressed the court.

"We shall ask, your honor, that this proceeding be directed in the regular form prescribed by the code—in other words, that the questions be submitted in writing."

Judge Hill overruled the motion. Mr. Burns was directed to take the stand, Solicitor Dorsey swore him, Mr. Burns standing. The solicitor questioned him.

"You are employed to investigate the murder of Mary Phagan, are you not?" "I am."

"By whom?" "I was first employed by Leonard and Herbert Haas."

"Attorneys for Frank?" "Yes."

AS TO BURNS' PAY.

"You have been paid some money, and some more is still due you?" "Yes."

"Is this conditional on your finding?" "No."

"Is there a contract in writing, for your services?" "Yes."

"What is the difference in the event Frank is liberated through your efforts?" "No difference."

"You have seen Frank in the jail and conferred with him frequently?" "Yes."

"After you had talked with him a short time, you were quoted in the papers as saying that he was not a pervert. Were you quoted correctly?" "Yes."

"Do you profess to be able by talking to a man a short while to tell whether he is a pervert?" "No, but I feel that by talking to him I can form a definite conclusion."

"How do you tell, that a man is not a pervert?" (Objection by Mr. Arnold overruled). "I am somewhat of a student of human nature. As I work with criminal classes, I frequently come in contact with them."

"You consider your opinion in the matter is trustworthy and accurate?" "I do."

"Did you have any conversation with Jim Conley before you came to the conclusion that he is a pervert?" "No."

"CONLEY A PERVERT."

"Then in his case you substituted a less trustworthy method?"

"After reading the letters that Conley wrote, and after examining the garments of Mary Phagan, I decided definitely that Conley is a pervert."

"How do you know he wrote the letters?" "I compared them with the so-called murder notes."

"Are you a handwriting expert, too?"

"No, but there are so many similar characteristics, there is no mistaking the letters."

"What is your definition of a pervert as applied to Conley?" "Well, there are different types. I would say that Conley is a sexual pervert who satisfies his sexual passions in an unnatural manner."

At this point Solicitor Dorsey saw Detective Dan Lehon, one of Mr. Burns' assistants in the court room, and asked that he be excluded. He was.

"What sort of a pervert do you say Conley is?" "I would say he is a fiendish pervert."

"What do you mean by that?" "A man who would commit murder to satisfy himself in an unusual way. There are various phases of ways to satisfy themselves merely by mutilating the body of the victim, or merely by mutilating the clothing."

"Is not perversion the crime of civilization and not of savagery?" "It is the crime of both."

"Then a pervert would not necessarily be an ignorant man?"
"No, but he might be."

ISOM'S PART IN CASE.

"Mr. Burns, after reading those letters you say Conley wrote, in what way would you say he was a pervert?" "In an unnatural way."

"Mr. Burns, Mr. Smith, Conley's counsel, gave you an opportunity to see Conley. Why did you not avail yourself of this privilege?" "Because of the restrictions thrown around it."

"Have you a man named Bob Adams in the employ of your agency?" "I have a man named Adams. I don't know whether his first name is Bob."

"Have you a man named W. W. Rogers, known as Boots Rogers?" "Yes."

"Have you a man named Charles Isom?" "No."

"Didn't Charles Isom go to Chicago with you to assist you in your interview with the negro, Aaron Allen?" "He did not."

"Didn't you have Allen in your charge for three days and bring Isom to Chicago to interview him?" "No."

"Isom did come to Chicago to see Allen, didn't he?" "Yes."

"How did he happen to come there to see Allen? Who sent him?" "I received a telegram from Herbert Haas, who said Isom was coming to Chicago and could get the truth out of Allen."

"Jake Jacobs was there to see Allen, too, wasn't he?" "Yes."

"Have you got a man named O'Neal working for you?" "Yes."

CAME WITH O'NEAL.

"This man O'Neal went to Indianapolis after Allen and brought him back to you in Chicago while he was sick, didn't he, Mr. Burns?" "I don't know anything about him having been sick; but he came to Chicago with O'Neal."

“hadn’t you interviewed Allen two or three times before Isom came to Chicago, and hadn’t you obtained an affidavit from him?”
“Yes, I had talked to him two or three times and had obtained a statement from him.”

“On the train returning from Chicago, Mr. Burns, didn’t you state to Isom that you had got the affidavit you wanted from Allen?” “No.”

“Didn’t Isom report to you?” “No, I asked him what he got from Allen. He told me nothing much; that he, Allen, had been placed in a cell with Newt Lee at police headquarters in Atlanta and that Newt Lee had told him, Allen, that he, Newt Lee, was innocent and that a white man had been put in a cell with Lee and had told Lee he had better keep his mouth shut or he would get us all in bad.”

“Mr. Stiles Hopkins was in Chicago, wasn’t he?” “Yes, he took Allen’s affidavit.”

“What time was Jacke Jacobs, the Decatur Street pawnbroker, there?” “They were all there about the same time.”

“Jake Jacobs is the man who swears to the character of Maude Carter, isn’t he?” “I don’t know.”

“Mr. Burns, what did you say to Allen? Didn’t you curse and abuse him?” “I did not.”

LEFT NO MONEY ON TABLE.

“Mr. Burns, tell us about the stack of money left on the table in your main office while Allen was there and while the rest of you withdrew from the room.” “No such thing happened.”

“Did you pay Allen anything?” “No.”

“Didn’t you authorize O’Neal to go to Indianapolis and tell Allen that you wanted him to do some work for you in an effort to catch a negro?” “No.”

"What authority did you have for taking Allen to Chicago and detaining him there?" "I never took him to Chicago and detaining him there?" "I never took him to Chicago, and I never detained him there."

PAID ISOM NOTHING.

"Do you deny that Isom was paid \$100 for his trip to Chicago?" "I never paid him anything."

"Have you a man in your employ named Carlton C. Tedder?" "I have not employed such a man."

"He is working for some of your agents, isn't he?" "I think he has been employed by Mr. Lehon."

"You have conferred with Tedder, haven't you?" "Yes."

"What sort of work did you have him doing? Working on the Conley case?" "Yes."

"Didn't you just say you were employed to work on the Frank case? If so, why did you have tedder working on the Conley case?" "I was employed to work on both cases."

"Why did you put Tedder on the Conley case?" "I never employed Tedder. I don't know just what arrangements Lehon had with him."

"Isn't Lehon one of your lieutenants, and doesn't he make his reports to you?"

"Lehon doesn't always report to me."

"Lehon is in charge of your investigations, isn't he, while you are travelling about the country investigating other tangles, isn't he?" "Yes."

DON'T GET ALL REPORTS.

"Doesn't he make written reports to you?" "Not always."

"Then he reports verbally to you?"

"Sometimes."

"Eventually and ultimately, do you get all the reports from your men in every case?" "No."

"Who does get these reports?" "Mr. Sears, the local manager, has charge of that; and our man Hause gets some of the reports."

"Tell the court here why it is you have been making special trips, travelling all over the country to Chicago, Kansas City, and other places, investigating various angles of the case, though you were specially employed to direct the investigation here, and still, you don't get all reports, either verbally or in writing." "I do not get them."

"Are matters reported to Frank's counsel before they are reported to you?" "No."

"Don't you report everything to Frank's counsel?" "No."

"Who does?" "Lehon and others."

"Why do you report to these men?" "So they will know what is going on in the case."

"When you conferred with Attorney Smith, Conley's lawyer, you knew Tedder was reporting to Smith, didn't you?" "Yes."

INQUIRED ABOUT TEDDER.

"At that time didn't you ask Smith if Tedder could be trusted implicitly?" "Yes."

"Why did you ask that question?" "I wished to know if Tedder was trustworthy."

"Did you direct your activities toward the conviction of Conley and the demonstration of Frank as an innocent man?" "No, not if Conley was innocent."

"When did you first know of the Ragsdale matter?" "Mr. Lehon first spoke to me about it."

“What did he say?” “He said there was a preacher who claimed to have been in an alley—and I stopped him right there. I didn’t want to hear any more alley propositions.”

“Then you had been surfeited with that?” “I had.”

“Who was the man in Chicago who claimed to have picked up a pocketbook and a pencil in the alley?” “I forgot the man’s name.”

“Didn’t you take an affidavit from him?” “No.”

“Who did?” “Mr. Haas, I think.”

“Is that affidavit in the city?” “I think it is.”

“How many of these alley propositions did you hear of?”
“Three or four hundred, I think.”

DID NOT FIND MAN.

“Did you find in Chicago a man who claimed to have been in the alley and who claimed to have picked up a purse and a pencil and a memorandum?” “I didn’t find him.”

“Who are some of the three or four hundred people who claimed to have been in the alley?” “The operatives kept telling me of them.”

“Why, for instance?” “Mr. Lehon and I were continually joking about the number of people who claimed to have been in the alley.”

“Did you dig up a man in Chicago?” “Yes.”

“Did you see the memorandum?” “Yes, and I doubted that the memorandum was in Conley’s handwriting.”

“Whose writing was it in?” “I think it was in the man’s own writing.”

“Is that the purse you spoke about?” “I don’t remember speaking about it.”

"Have you in your safe a purse that was claimed to have been found in the alley?" "No."

"You were credited by stories in the newspapers of Cleveland with saying that the guilty man in this case was at large. Is that report, correct?" "No. The newspapers have often misquoted me."

"Tobie is your man in Chicago, isn't he?" "Yes."

"He was employed down here in this case, wasn't he?" "I understand by hearsay that he was."

SAYS FELDER HIRED TOBIE.

"Who employed him?" "I understand Tom Felder did."

"Did Tobie ever report on the case to you?" "No."

"Did you ever hear of what Tobie found?" "Only through the newspapers."

"When did the Ragsdale matter first come to your attention?" "A week or ten days before he made the affidavit."

"Who else was present when Lehon brought it to your attention?" "Possibly Sears."

"Charley Sears?" "Yes."

"When did you next hear of it?" "Lehon came in and said the character of the preacher has been sustained—No, wait a minute; I did hear from Lehon before then that the preacher was corroborated and I told him then I didn't want to have anything to do with a man who had that much knowledge and withheld it so long. Lehon later came in and told me the man's character had been sustained. I told him I would have nothing to do with it and advised him to take the matter to the attorneys and let them investigate it and do what they wanted to with it."

"When was that?" "Two or three days before the affidavit was made."

"Did you ever talk with Arthur Thurman?" "No."

KNOWS OF NO MONEY PAID.

"Did you know that Messrs. Arnold and Rosser had talked about it?" "I don't remember it."

"Do you know if any money was paid to Ragsdale?" "I do not."

"To Barber?" "I do not."

"To C. C. Tedder?" "No."

"To Arthur Thurman?" "No."

"Would you have known, or would the money have been handled in such a way you wouldn't know?" "If any of my men did such a thing, he violated all the rules of the agency."

"You are more familiar with the Anna Maud Carter proposition than with the Ragsdale incident, are you not?" "Yes."

"Then you are the discoverer of that, are you not?" "I wouldn't say that"

"Who deserves the credit for it?" "I first saw her in the office of Attorney Haas."

"Did you ever come in contact with Jimmie Wrenn?" "Yes, I saw two Wrenns."

"Where and how did you happen to meet them?" "I saw them while they were working with Burke."

"Have you ever been to see Frank with Burke?" "No, never."

"Did you ever see Dr. George Wrenn in the Tower?" "No."

"What Burns man handled this Wrenn matter?" "None, that I know of."

"When did you see Wrenn?" "He came to my office when I sent for him to get some one who was familiar with the letters."

"Was that Dr. Wrenn?" "I don't know. IT was a man about 25 or 26 years old."

"He is the man who furnished you with the translation of these letters?" "He translated them for me, then Leonard Haas translated them."

"When did you tell counsel for Frank about the notes?" "Two of them, Messrs. Leonard and Herbert Haas, were present when I got them."

"How long before the first hearing of the extraordinary motion was that?" "I don't know."

"When was it?" "Wrenn interpreted the notes only four or five days ago."

"How long did you have them in your possession before they were interpreted?" "Two or three days."

"Who gave them to you?" "C. W. Burke."

"Then Burke deserves the credit for this?" "Yes."

WHAT BURNS HAS DONE.

"Tell us of one thing you have done in the—how long is it? Sixty days?—that you have been at work on this case." "Well, I have read the brief of evidence very carefully. I went over the factory. I interviewed the witnesses there. I came to your office and examined the garments of the dead girl, and I made a report to the attorneys that they didn't need any more evidence than was in the record."

"There were over 100 state's witnesses. How many of them have you examined?" "I don't know."

"Who handled the Carter woman last before you got hold of her?" "The Messrs. Haas."

"What was it you told the Carter woman's mother when she came to you about her daughter?" "I told her I would arrange for her to go to see her daughter."

"Did you do it?" "No, she never came back."

"Who attended to the details of getting Annie Carter out of town?" "I don't know. Perhaps Mr. Lehon."

NO OTHER EVIDENCE.

"Mr. Burns, have you in your possession or within your knowledge any evidence of a physical nature, not already before the court, tending to expose the murderer of Mary Phagan?"

"No."

"Have you any documentary evidence in your possession or within your knowledge not already before the court, tending to expose the murderer of Mary Phagan?" "No."

"Mr. Burns, I want to put those questions a little differently. Have you in your possession or within your knowledge, any physical evidence not already turned over to the lawyers for the defense which tends to expose the murderer of Mary Phagan?"

"No."

"Have you in your possession or within your knowledge any documentary evidence, not already turned over to the lawyers for the defense, that tends to expose the murderer of Mary Phagan?"

"No."

"Have you, knowledge of any witnesses or other evidence tending to expose the murderer of Mary Phagan which you have not already turned over to the lawyers for the defense?" "No."

"When did you make your full and detailed report to the lawyers for the defense?" "I am reporting every day."

"When did you make your last report?" "Probably a day or two ago."

"Be more specific." "I can't. I don't recollect."

"When did you talk last to the lawyers for the defense?" "This morning."

"You talked to them last night and this morning?" "Yes."

"Have you seen and read a copy of the defense's motion and amendments in this case?" "No."

"Do you know of any evidence or issue not already in the hands o tehse men and already reported tot eh court?" "No."

ARNOLD QUESTIONS BURNS.

Here Mr. Dorsey finished his cross-examination and Attorney Reuben R. Arnold, for the defense, began to question Mr. Burns.

"Mr. Burns," began Mr. Arnold, "have you found it difficult on account of the attitude of the public to make an investigation in this case?" "Extremely so."

"Have you in all of your experience ever encountered more stubborn and unreasoning prejudice?" "I most certainly have not."

"Have you in all your experience ever found people so unwilling to tell even the simple truth?" "I never have."

"Have you not found it difficult to hold a man's evidence after you have obtained it?" "I have."

"Did you ever know of anything more outrageous than the Albert McKnight case?" (Mr. Arnold was referring to the Frank witness who furnished an affidavit to the state recanting his reputation of his trial testimony, while locked up in a cell at police station.) "I have not."

"You read Albert McKnight's affidavit?" "Yes."

"You went to Albert McKnight after he gave the defense this affidavit?" "Yes."

READ CONLEY'S EVIDENCE.

"Did you read Jim Conley's evidence?" "Yes."

"Have you ever heard of a court, jury, or community accepting such an explanation for such a crime?" "I have not."

"From your investigation who do you think is guilty of the murder of Mary Phagan?" "Unquestionably Jim Conley."

Attorney Arnold here asked Mr. Burns if he had read certain trial testimony relating to Conley's changing of his statements. The detective replied that he had.

Judge Hill then interrupted, telling Attorney Arnold he would have to discontinue that line of questions.

"It seems to me, your honor," said Attorney Arnold, "that you are giving the solicitor a wider latitude in his questions than you are giving me."

"I won't permit you to ask questions which reflect on the jury's verdict or the ruling by the supreme court," replied Judge Hill.

Attorney Arnold resumed his questioning of Burns. "Mr. Burns, did you ever talk to Conley?" "No."

"Where is he held?" "He's kept locked up in jail."

"Is any one allowed to talk to him?" "No."

"Why didn't you embrace the privilege offered you by W. M. Smith, Conley's lawyer, to talk to him?" "Because of Smith's terms."

"What were those terms?" "Why, Smith demanded that he be present and a reporter be there."

"You arrived at your conclusion that Conley was a pervert from the character of the letters he wrote to Annie Maude Carter and the manner in which the dead girl's clothing was mutilated, didn't you?" "Yes."

LETTERS WERE VILE.

"What were the contents of those letters?" "Why, they were very vile. They showed the writer's mind was saturated with lust. I never saw an instance more filled with that character of perversion."

"Mr. Burns, did you ever attempt to get anything in this case except the truth?" "No."

"Did you ever by the offer of bribes, intimidation or coercion or any other improper methods seek to obtain evidence from witnesses?" "I assuredly did not."

"Were you besieged by people proffering absurd things as evidence?" "Yes, by hundreds of them."

"And you found it difficult to estimate the motives actuating them?" "I did."

"And you found it difficult to estimate the motives actuating them?" "I did."

With this question, Mr. Arnold ended his examination and Solicitor Dorsey took up a redirect examination of Detective Burns.

The solicitor said: "Mr. Burns, what instances can you cite where obstacles were thrown in your way?" "I consider the Jim Conley situation and the Monteen Stover situation as perfectly outrageous."

"Why did you consider it outrageous for private individuals to refuse to submit to a cross-examination by four or five different men who were in the pay of a convict or his friends?" "I supposed the object of everyone was to bring out the real facts and to find the murderer."

"What caused you to change your supposition?" "The attitude of many persons, including some lawyers."

REFERS TO SOLICITOR.

"What lawyers do you refer to?" "Why, you refused to discuss the case with me."

"After you told me," quickly answered the solicitor, "you thought Frank innocent, and after you told me you would report in

a few days and that your report would state Frank was innocent and Conley was guilty.”

“Yes,” said Burns. “You told me if that was true, there was no use in discussing the case further.”

The solicitor said: “But you made an appointment with me. You told me I could have the opportunity to convince you of Frank’s guilt. I told you that you were attacking a verdict of the court, and that if you wished I would give you an opportunity to convince me of Frank’s innocence.”

“The solicitor’s attitude led me to think he would not discuss the case with an open mind,” Burns explained to the court.

Dorsey asked him to give other instances where he had been hampered in his investigation, and Burns replied that he had been told by lawyers for the defense that certain witnesses were impossible to get at.

“Who gave you such advice?” “Both Mr. Leonard and Mr. Herbert Haas.”

“Did Mr. Arnold give you such advice?” “Perhaps so.”

“Did Mr. Rosser give you such advice?” “Maybe he did.”

KNEW CONLEY WAS PERVERT.

“With all your ability to discern perverts, tell the court how you could determine that Conley was a pervert without ever having heard him utter a word.” “I knew this from the character of the notes he wrote the Carter woman and also from the manner in which the dead girl’s under garments were mutilated.”

“How do you know Conley ever had his hands on those garments?” “The manner in which these garments were cut indicates that it was the act of a man with a perverted mind such as Conley betrays in the notes.”

“You say many absurd matters were reported to you.” “Why, all the men who have claimed that they were in the alley in the

rear of the pencil factory on April 26, 1913, would make up a pretentious parade.”

“Did anyone tell you that they had heard screams from the pencil factory?” “No.”

“How about that Salvation Army man in Chicago?” “I questioned him relative to the report that he had seen Conley in the alley.”

“Then you were directing your principal attention Conley” “No.”

KNEW OF AFFIDAVIT.

“You knew of Mary Rich’s affidavit before you talked with the Salvation Army man?” “Yes.”

“And you were endeavoring to corroborate her affidavit?” “No; I simply sought to find out what truth there was in the report that the Salvation Army man had seen Conley in the pencil factory alley.”

“Tell the court of any incidents on the part of the people showing prejudice.” “I refer to the manner in which Albert McKnight was handled and to numerous statements which I have read in the public prints.”

“Does that include Burke’s effort to send McKnight out of town?” “No.”

“Does it include Lehon’s spiriting away of Anna Maude Carter?” “No.”

“During your investigation what criminal act did you ever discover that Conley had committed?” “I don’t know that I have discovered any except as to his general character.”

“Come down, Mr. Burns,” smilingly directed the solicitor, and the detective left the stand. This concluded the examination, the solicitor announcing that he would examine Lehon Monday morning.

Dorsey to Lay Frank Case Before Grand Jury

Solicitor General Dorsey announced Saturday afternoon that if he has time during the next week, he will take up the various ramifications of the Frank case with the grand jury, which will be impaneled next Monday.

The solicitor would not be specific, but stated simply: "I am going to put this whole matter before the grand jury—that is, if we have time to reach it during the week."

The solicitor would say nothing more except that he has his men out looking for Jimmy Wrenn, who has been identified with C. W. Burke, one of the agents of the defense; for a man named Eubanks, said to be Burns' worker, and a man named Lynn, chauffeur for Burke.

PDF PAGE 2, COLUMN 1

**ANGRY CROWD
DRIVES**

BURNS FROM MARIETTA

Detective, After Being Struck, Is Forced to Seek Refuge In Hotel

Detective William J. Burns was driven out of Marietta Friday evening, after a demonstration against him in which several hundred men, who had gathered about the polls of the city (an election being in progress), took part.

The detective, who was accompanied by Dan S. Lehon, one of his lieutenants, was not seriously injured, although he was struck in the face by one man, threatened with a knife by another, and verbally insulted and abused by the crowd.

Burns and Lehon were passing through Marietta, en route to Cewartown, in a big limousine, when a tire blew out. The two men left the car and walked to the Brumby garage on Church Street. Burns was recognized by a crowd of people standing about. Some of them yelled: "There goes William Jackass Burns!"

Burns and Lehon kept on to the garage and the crowd followed, being rapidly augmented.

When they reached the garage, Robert Howell stepped up to the detective and said: "This is Burns, isn't it?"

The detective is said to have denied his identity, then Howell called him a "— liar."

HOWELL STRIKES BURNS.

"I have promised to beat you if you ever came to Marietta, and here goes," Howell is said to have added, striking the detective first on one cheek and then on the other.

Mr. Burns in his version of the affair says that at this point another man tried to reach him with a knife, but was held by Lehon.

Howell kicked at the detective several times and Burns made a break, past the crowd, to the trolley line depot. He was headed off by a big crowd, and dodged into the Whitlock hotel.

The crowd increased every second in size, as Friday was election day for Cobb County and the streets of Marietta were thronged with people at the time.

Burns once tried to escape from the hotel by the back way, but the place was well surrounded, and he had to hasten back.

While Burns was hemmed in the hotel, Robert Howell spied the chauffeur who carried the two detectives to Marietta in the car. He is said to have walked up to the chauffeur and after cursing him ordered him out of the car. The chauffeur jumped to the ground, trembling, but was not further molested and after Howell left the vicinity, citizens told him to get in the car and make for Atlanta.

LEHON FINDS REFUGE.

In the meantime, Lehon, separated from his chief, found shelter and protection in the office of Deputy Sheriff J. M. Hicks.

The crowd in front of the hotel shouted angrily at Burns, and finally Mayor J. E. Dobbs, Judge Newt Morris, former judge of the superior court of the Cherokee Circuit, and Dr. J. H. Patton, a well known minister, made short talks to the crowd urging no violence and begging them to disperse.

The rumor had gone the rounds in Marietta that the detective had been driven from Atlanta, and the shout of the crowd was "Burns can't say in Cobb County."

Finally Judge Morris asked the crowd if it would be satisfied should Burns leave immediately, not to return. The members agreed not to harm him, on this condition.

T. M. Brumby, a well-known citizen, brought his car around, and Burns stepped from the hotel. He got into the car and it dashed away.

Besides Mr. Brumby, Judge Morris accompanied the detective to the city.

Lehon, after remaining for another half hour under the protection of the deputy sheriff, was furnished with an automobile and he joined his chief at the Piedmont hotel.

No members of the crowd have been arrested.

Marietta is the birthplace of little Mary Phagan, and the feeling there about her murder is intense.

Burns Says Attack Was Not Provoked

In his apartments at the

Piedmont hotel Saturday morning Mr. Burns commented on the Marietta episode as follows:

“It was the most outrageous demonstration I’ve ever known. Neither Mr. Lehon nor myself did or said anything to provoke it. I am quite sure the 200-odd men and boys who participated in this demonstration did not represent the better element of Marietta and Cobb County citizenry.”

“Mr. Lehon and I were en route to Cedartown to keep an engagement. The automobile in which we were travelling broke down at Marietta and Mr. Lehon get mechanical assistance. On our arrival there, the crowd formed. It was led by a man named Howell, who cursed and threatened us. One man whose name I did not learn, held an open knife in his hand and was threatening to cut my throat, when Mr. Lehon took hold of him and held him.”

“Howell, backed up by the crowd, advanced on me and struck me, all the while uttering vile and insulting language. As the crowd became more threatening, I walked up the street to the Whitlock house, in which I remained for more than an hour until Judge Morris and a deputy sheriff persuaded those taking part in the demonstration to allow me to leave in an automobile.”

“I shall not allow this outrageous incident to deter me in the least from complementing my work in the Frank case, and I believe the fair-minded people of Georgia and the south will condemn the uncalled-for attack.”

J. E. Duffy, one of the witnesses quoted by the defense in the extraordinary motion, was placed under arrest Friday evening by Newt Garner, an attaché of the solicitor’s office. Judge Hill on Friday morning had issued an attachment for Duffy, who had refused to talk with the solicitor’s assistants.
